



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/590,320

06/13/2007

Vladimir Jovanovich

742408-11

8145

22204

7590

06/22/2010

NIXON PEABODY, LLP

401 9TH STREET, NW

SUITE 900

WASHINGTON, DC 20004-2128

EXAMINER

RAMADAN, RAMY O

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2858

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/22/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/590,320	<b>Applicant(s)</b> JOVANOVIH, VLADIMIR	
	<b>Examiner</b> RAMY RAMADAN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2858	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 August 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 August 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>08/01/2008</u> .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

Art Unit: 2858

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-15 are now pending in the application and ready for examination.

**Drawings**

2. The drawings filed on August 23, 2006 have been reviewed and are acceptable.

**Information Disclosure Statement**

3. The Information Disclosure Statement dated August 01, 2008 has been acknowledged by the examiner and the cited reference(s) have been considered in the examination of the pending claims. As required by M.P.E.P 609 C (2), a copy of the Information Disclosure Statement initiated and dated by the examiner is attached.

**Specification**

4. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it exceeds 150 words. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112**

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. **Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. The following are some of the errors and indefinite language in the claims:

With respect to claim 1, the phrases "can be" and "a possibility for" in line 2, render the claim indefinite. The limitations "the data" in line 6, and "the electronic paper" is lines 8-9, lack sufficient antecedent basis in the claim. The use of parentheses in the lines 6-7, renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) between the parentheses are part

Art Unit: 2858

of the claimed invention. The abbreviation "i.e." in line 9, renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the abbreviation are part of the claimed invention.

See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

With respect to claim 4, the limitation "the display module" in line 2, lacks sufficient antecedent basis in the claim.

With respect to claim 5, the word "it" renders the claim indefinite as it is not clear what element in the claim the word it is referring to. The limitation "the displayed information" lacks sufficient antecedent basis in the claim.

With respect to claim 7, the limitation "the electronic complex" lacks sufficient antecedent basis in the claim. The abbreviation "i.e." renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the abbreviation are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

With respect to claim 8, the word "is" in line 2, should read as --are--. The limitation "an electric energy source" is indefinite as it is not clear whether the limitation is referring to the electric energy source of claim 1 or to a second electric energy source. The word "it" renders the claim indefinite as it is not clear what element in the claim the word it is referring to.

With respect to claim 9, the use of parentheses renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) between the parentheses are part of the claimed invention. The word "it" renders the claim indefinite as it is not clear what element in the claim the word it is referring to. The limitation "so the two make the one as a whole" is vague and indefinite.

With respect to claim 10, the limitation "the thin, rechargeable battery" lacks sufficient antecedent basis in the claim.

With respect to claim 11, the word "its" renders the claim indefinite as it is not clear what element in the claim the word it is referring to.

Art Unit: 2858

With respect to claim 13, the limitation "the registration plate holders" lacks sufficient antecedent basis in the claim.

With respect to claims 14 and 15, the claims are generally indefinite and contain improper language.

**Conclusion**

7. The prior art cited in the PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RAMY RAMADAN whose telephone number is (571) 272-9761. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:30 am-5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, PATRICK ASSOUD can be reached on (571) 272-2210. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ramy Ramadan/  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2858

/RR/

Application/Control Number: 10/590,320

Page 5

Art Unit: 2858

/Patrick J Assouad/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2858